

REMARKS

Claims 1-18 were pending in the application.  
Claims 1-18 are rejected as anticipated.  
Claim 9, 16, 17, and 18 are amended.  
Claims 1-18 remain pending in the application.

Rejections under 35 USC 102

In the Office Action at page 2, Claims 1-18 were rejected under 35 USC 102(e) as being anticipated by Li et al., US Patent Pub. No. 2004/0193912, hereinafter Li.

Claims 1-8

With regard to Claim 1, in the Office Action at page 3, the Examiner asserts:

...Li et al. teaches a system comprising a security management system comprising:

- A network security feedback and control system wherein said security feedback and control system receives a plurality of normalized events and issues at least one normalized command in response to a predefined event in said plurality of normalized events (paragraph 0022-0023).

Applicants respectfully traverse the anticipation rejections of each of Claims 1-8.

The citations to Li at paragraphs 0022-0023 describe in part:

In some embodiments, the updated changes to the policy repository 110 are then automatically communicated to or discovered by the PDP 112, and an analysis is performed based on predefined conditions and thresholds. In other embodiments if human intervention is not necessary before pushing the **updated policies** to the PEPs, the analysis can result in dynamic and adaptive changes to a number of

security policies included within the policy repository 110, and **automatically pushed by the PDP 112 to one or more PEPs 113.**

Applicants submit the above citations to Li merely describe that the PDP 112 pushes **security policies** to one or more PEPs 113, and not "normalized commands" as recited in part in Claim 1.

Indeed, Li at paragraph 0020 describes:

The PDP 112 pushes **security policies** to one or more PEPs 113. (emphasis added)

Distinguishably, Applicants Claim 1 recites in part:

...a security management system comprising:  
a network security feedback and control system wherein said security feedback and control system receives a plurality of normalized events and **issues at least one normalized command** in response to a predefined event in said plurality of normalized events. (emphasis added)

Applicants respectfully submit the citations to Li relied on by the Examiner do not describe or suggest at least issuance of "...at least one **normalized command** in response to a predefined event in said plurality of normalized events" as recited in part in Claim 1 (emphasis added).

Based on the above remarks, Applicants respectfully submit the citations to Li relied on by the Examiner do not support an anticipation rejection of Claim 1. As Claims 2-8 depend directly or indirectly from Claim 1, for at least the same reasons as Claim 1, Claims 2-8 are also not anticipated by Li.

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the anticipation rejections of each of Claims 1-8.

Claims 9-15

Applicants have amended Claim 9.

With regard to Claim 9, in the Office Action at page 4, the Examiner asserts:

...Li et al. teaches a system comprising:

- An event subscription filter (fig. 2, ref. num 220); and
- A feedback and control manager coupled to said event subscription filter (fig. 2, ref. num 240).

Applicants respectfully submit reference number 220 of FIG. 2 merely describes "ENFORCE POLICIES ON DEVICE(S)". Further, reference number 240 of FIG. 2 merely describes "ANALYZE FEEDBACK DATA (INTRUSION DETECTION, DEVICE AUDIT LOG ALERTS, AND OTHERS).

Distinguishably, Applicants Claim 9 as amended recites in part at least:

...a feedback and control manager coupled to said event subscription filter, wherein said feedback and control manager processes at least one normalized event received from said event subscription filter and **issues at least one normalized command** for use in dynamically implementing a predefined security policy. (emphasis added)

Applicants respectfully submit the citations to Li relied on by the Examiner do not describe or suggest at least issuance of "...at least one **normalized command**" as recited in part in Claim 9 (emphasis added).

Based on the above remarks, Applicants respectfully submit the citations to Li relied on by the Examiner do not support an anticipation rejection of Claim 9 as amended. As Claims 10-15 depend directly or indirectly from Claim 9, for at least the same reasons as Claim 9, Claims 10-15 are also not anticipated by Li.

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the anticipation rejections of each of Claims 9-15.

Claims 16-18

Applicants have amended Claims 16, 17, and 18.

With regard to Claims 16-18, in the Office Action at page 5, the Examiner asserts:

...Li et al. teaches a method/computer-program product/structure comprising:

- Receiving events from managed products by a network security feedback and control system (fig. 2, ref. num 230 and 240); and
- Using information in said events by said network security feedback and control system in dynamically implementing a predefined security policy (fig. 2, ref. num 250 and 252).

Applicants respectfully submit reference numbers 230 and 240 of FIG. 2 were earlier discussed with regard to Claim 9. Reference numbers 250 and 252 of FIG. 2 merely describe "UPDATE POLICY REPOSITORY WITH SECURITY INFORMATION OR EVENT INFORMATION" and "DYNAMICALLY ADJUST SECURITY POLICIES", respectively.

Distinguishably, Claim 16 as amended recites in part at least:

...using information in said plurality of normalized events by said network feedback and control system in dynamically implementing a predefined security policy by **issuing at least one normalized command** in response to a predefined event in said plurality of normalized events. (emphasis added)

Applicants respectfully submit the citations to Li relied on by the Examiner do not describe or suggest at least issuance of "...at least one **normalized command** in response to a predefined event in said plurality of normalized events" as recited in part in Claim 16 as amended.

Based on the above remarks, Applicants respectfully submit the citations to Li relied on by the Examiner do not support an anticipation rejection of Claims 16. As Claims 17 and Claim 18 were amended similarly to Claim 16, Applicants submit that for at least the same reasons as Claim 16, Claims 17 and Claim 18 are also not anticipated by Li.

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the anticipation rejections of each of Claims 16, 17 and 18.

#### Conclusion

Claims 1-18 remain in the application.

For the foregoing reasons, Applicants respectfully request allowance of all pending claims. If the Examiner has any questions relating to the above, the Examiner is respectfully requested to telephone the undersigned Attorney for Applicant(s).

#### Request for Examiner Interview

Should the Examiner be of the opinion that this amendment does not place the Application in a condition for allowance, Applicants respectfully request an Examiner interview prior to issuance of the next communication from the USPTO to expedite prosecution.

#### **CERTIFICATE OF MAILING**

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service with sufficient postage as first class mail in an envelope addressed to: Mail Stop Amendment, Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450, on October 9, 2007.

  
Attorney for Applicant(s)

October 9, 2007  
Date of Signature

Respectfully submitted,



Lisa A. Norris  
Attorney for Applicant(s)  
Reg. No. 44,976  
Tel.: (831) 655-0880